

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully considered the May 19, 2005 Office Action regarding the above-identified application. The amendments to the specification and abstract as well as the claim amendments and the remarks that follow are presented in a bona fide effort to respond thereto and address all issues raised in that Action. Prompt favorable reconsideration of this amended application is requested.

The Office Action applied U.S. Patent No. 6,192,361 to Huang, but that patent was not listed on any of the citation forms (PTO-892 or PTO-1449) accompanying the Office Action. It is requested that the Examiner list Huang on a PTO-892 citation form and enter that form in the record with the next Official communication regarding this application.

The Action included an objection to the specification for lack of a reference to "Fig. 1." By amendment above, Applicants have added reference to Fig. 1, to the first full paragraph on page 6.

The claims have been amended to address indefiniteness issues and formality objections. The independent claims also have been amended to clarify distinctions over applied art and thereby help to overcome art rejections. Unless amended claim language is specifically referenced in a traversal of an art rejection below, it is believed that the revised claim language only provides improved grammar or clarity and as such does not narrow the scope of any amended claim.

Paragraphs 5-7 of the Detailed Action listed a series of objections to the claim language; and the Action included a rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, which identified a number of points in the claims that allegedly were indefinite. The claims have been extensively amended above. It is believed that the claim revisions address each point noted as informal in the objections and each point alleged to be indefinite in the 112 rejection. As these

Application No.: 10/021,550

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Please substitute the attached drawing sheets for the original drawings sheets which contained Figs. 3-5.

amendments are formalistic and clarifying in nature, it is believed that the original claims and written description provide clear support for all such changes. The amendments should be fairly self explanatory on these points, and further comments here should be unnecessary. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the claims and the indefiniteness rejection.

One point raised in the claim objection (item number 7, in the Detailed Action), however, may warrant more specific discussion. The objection asserted that use of the terms “certify” and “certification” in the claims was inappropriate in view of art accepted usage of such terms and suggested that “authentication” would be more appropriate. As suggested, all occurrences of “certify,” “certified” and “certification” in the claims have been changed to corresponding derivatives of the verb “authenticate.” Also, Applicants have changed the wordings “certify,” “certified,” “certifying,” and “certification” to --authenticate,-- --authenticated,-- --authenticating,-- and --authentication,-- respectively throughout all pages of the specification, claims, Abstract and drawings.

From the Action, it is clear the Examiner understood how the original documents substantially supported the new --authenticate-- terminology and that such terminology is more in line with typical art accepted terms and definitions than “certify” (see the Examiner’s comments on page 2 of the Action). It is therefore submitted that the specification, claim and drawing amendments on the point do not introduce new subject matter.

Claims 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,564 to Harter et al. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-10, 12, 16-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,192,361 to Huang (which was omitted from the

PTO-892). Claims 9 and 16 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833 to Moshfeghi.

On page 8, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 17, 18 and 20 for obviousness. The initial statement (#28) cited the Harter et al. patent and U.S. Patent No. 5,450,593 to Howell et al. However, the subsequent detailed explanation relied on the Stallings literature document (#29) or on Official Notice (#30), but he did not rely on the cited Howell et al. patent. Subsequent rejections inherit this confusion over what references are applied.

Claims 3, 11 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Harter et al., Howell et al. (Stallings?) and the Stein literature document.

Claims 5 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Harter et al., Howell et al. (Stallings?) and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0198829 to Ludwig et al.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 14 and 17 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,476,833 to Moshfeghi in combination with Stein, although the explanation relies on Stallings rather than Stein. Claims 7 and 15 then were rejected as obvious over Moshfeghi and Stein (Stallings?) further in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,029,160 to Cabrera et al.

The art rejections are traversed. According to the present disclosure referring to Fig. 1, the management object creates interfaces by authenticating a second manager ID and a second password that are received from the manager, in accordance with a first ID and a first password that were stored beforehand. The interfaces permit an access to the data file during the predetermined permission time from the authenticated manager. Although the independent claims vary in scope, each does include recitations regarding this ID and password authentication and the creation of interfaces for the manager when both ID and password authentications

succeed. Claims 1 and 17 specify that interfaces expire after a predetermined permission time. Claims 1 and 9 specify that the created interfaces permit the manager access during a “predetermined permission time.”

None of the cited documents nor any of the proposed combinations teach this technique. The Action cites Huang (column 15, lines 43 et seq.) for an alleged teaching to expire an interface after a predetermined time (see paragraph 24 at top of page 7 of Detailed Action). However, the cited text of Huang does not provide such a teaching. This part of Huang teaches termination of logon after a period of activity. Apparently, as long as activity continues, logon continues. Permission expires when the user activity ceases (plus some inactivity period). Permission does not expire after a predetermined permission time.

Harter (‘564) applied as an allegedly anticipatory reference and as a base reference in several obviousness rejections provides no teachings on point with regard to the predetermined permission time.

Instead, the obviousness rejection starting with Harter (‘565) as the base reference apparently alleges that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention would expire interfaces after a log-out has been received in order to prevent any potential attacks or an unauthorized access (see paragraphs 28-29 on page 8 of the Detailed Action). Stallings apparently is cited to support the conclusions of obviousness. However, such an allegedly obvious approach does not teach that the interface expires after a predetermined time or permits an access during a predetermined time, as in the claims. (Compare with Harter (‘565) and the combination of Harter (‘564), Howell (‘593), and Stalling.) The rejections that start with Moshfeghi include the same apparent error regarding permission time (see e.g. paragraph 38-39

on page 4 of the Detailed Action). It is submitted that the independent claims are novel and those claims patentably distinguish over the applied art.

As noted, the Action apparently cites Stallings for a teaching of a time limit. However, the application of Stallings in the rejections is quite confusing in the Office Action. Although not cited in the initial statements of the rejections, the detailed explanations assert that page 328 of Stallings teaches revoking access after a predetermined time. The 103 rejections of claim 1 apparently rely on this part of Stallings to support the conclusion that it would have been obvious to expire the 'interfaces' in various other patents after a predetermined time. Applicants respectfully disagree with the conclusion of obviousness, and with the assertion that Stallings makes adding a permission time obvious in the present case. The ticket granting process of Stallings appears quite different and non-analogous to the file access interfaces of Harter or Moshfeghi. Hence, even if Stallings is relied upon in the rejections, it is believed that the amended claims as a whole would not have been obvious and therefore patentably distinguish over the art.

Claim 6 further recites an information file for storing a plurality of functions of a remote method invocation protocol and a plurality of flags for defining which manager is permitted to use which function. See permission information file 104-2 and flags 107b shown in Fig. 5. Claim 4 further recites different interfaces created by the management object which created the interfaces of claim 1. These features further distinguish over the art.

Other reference also fail to teach the inventions recited in the amended claims.

Upon entry of the above claim amendments, claims 1-20 remain active in this application, all of which should be definite and patentable over the art applied in the Action. It is submitted that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, this case should

Application No.: 10/021,550

now be ready to pass to issue; and Applicants respectfully request a prompt favorable reconsideration of this matter.

It is believed that this response addresses all issues raised in the May 19, 2005 Office Action. However, if any further issue should arise that may be addressed in an interview or obviated by an Examiner's amendment, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' representative at the number shown below.

To the extent necessary, if any, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Keith E. George
Registration No. 34,111

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8603 KEG:apr
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: August 1, 2005

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**